Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 10:50 am

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 9:58 am
> People's interest or none interest CERTAINLY DOES NOT have ANY BEARING ON what is ACTUALLY REAL, and True.

Information can tell us everything. It has all the answers. But they are answers to questions we have not asked, and which doubtless don't even arise.

Knowledge is a mirage.

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 11:13 am

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 9:58 am
> If one loses interest in the IRREFUTABLE Fact that the Universe, Itself, IS infinite, and/or eternal, is of NO REAL CONCERN AT ALL. People's interest or none interest CERTAINLY DOES NOT have ANY BEARING ON what is ACTUALLY REAL, and True.

There is nothing more mysterious than a TV set left on in an empty room.

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:32 pm

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 3:46 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 06, 2025 3:33 am
> > As expressed existence itself has no reason or why. Those are complexities concerning conscious beings and particular things.
> >
> > Reason is an aspect of existence, not a cause of existence or something beyond existence.
> >
> > Reason could not cause or initiate existence when reason itself is existence.
> >
> > To reiterate there is no reason or why for existence. Existence simply is. Reason and why concern conscious beings and particular or specific things.
> >
> > You seem to claim existence itself has or had some reason for being. I'm asking that you provide an example of such reason not involving conscious beings or particular things to illustrate such reason for existence itself. Illustrate your point.
>
> OBVIOUSLY it is an ABSOLUTE IMPOSSIBILITY to provide examples of 'reason' or 'why' for absolutely ANY thing, which does not involve conscious human beings.
>
> ONLY conscious human beings can 'make up' reasons or whys, and only conscious human beings can express and receive reasons and whys. So, again, it is IMPOSSIBLE to provide examples of 'reason' and 'why', which do not involve conscious human beings. So, it does NOT MAKE ACTUAL SENSE to ASK FOR examples that could NEVER be provided.
>
> LOL ONCE MORE NO one can PROVIDE you of what you are ASKING FOR, here, BECAUSE it is, OBVIOUSLY, an IMPOSSIBILITY.
>
> you are CONFLATED TWO DIFFERENT things, and then 'TRYING TO' CLAIM that because one can NOT BE DONE, therefore, the other does EXIST.

Precisely the point.

Reason for existence cannot be provided not because things are conflated, rather because existence itself lacks reason.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:41 pm

> **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:35 am
> Once you know that unicorns don't exist…

Then to what are you referring?

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:50 pm

> **Ben JS** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 2:56 am
> For what it's worth,
> these ideas go back millennia.
> So we were both beaten to the punch.

This is eternal knowledge. Not sports.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Ben JS** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 7:04 pm

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:50 pm
> This is eternal knowledge.

I think it's better described as eternal truth.

Truth: the quality or state of being true / that which is true or in accordance with fact or reality
Knowledge: The state or fact of knowing

Truth remains regardless of whether anything is aware of it.
Knowledge is dependent on a subject discovering/recognizing it (as you rightly say).

Truth is present in any place within existence - any state of existence.
In a place without conscious entities that can recognize - knowledge is absent.

Truth resides everywhere. Knowledge resides within the subject.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jun 19, 2023 12:57 am
> This is not my philosophy. [...] I did not invent it. Supposing all detailed in the original essay is accurate no one would have contrived or invented this philosophy or this description of what is. It would be eternal knowledge, existent and present forever. Individuals discover it, they stumble upon it from time to time throughout eternity and express it for others to contemplate.

Very respectable. This builds esteem.

Ben JS
Posts: 223
Joined: Fri Dec 16, 2022 10:38 am
Location: Australia

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Ben JS** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 7:05 pm

Me rambling:

A person who went by James S. Saint on ILP defined existence as affectance.
That which is exists, is that which has the capacity to affect anything else that exists.
He called it Rational Metaphysics.

Awareness exists, and through this awareness, the existence of all else is inferred / recognized.
It's like a metric for what rationally ought have any relevance.
As if some hypothetical thing has no capacity to affect anything else that exists,
then to disregard it has no consequence - nor could it's consideration provide utility.

This is my most preferred definition of existence that I've encountered.

-

What is the most rational division of space?

The smallest possible change.

If between two states, no thing has changed -
then these two states can be considered identical.
There's no reason to consider them different.

A unique state of existence.

[If existence is a circle,
and determinism true,
then from any unique state,
every other state of existence,
will unfold in the same order -
such that any state could be considered
the start or end of the loop.
Meaning -
if you travel from one state of existence,
until you meet an identical state of existence,
you've now made a loop of existence.
Traveling further would only be a repeat.

But it is possible existence never repeats.
There are known pattern expansions that would never repeat -
and also plenty that do.]

Time is the measure of change -
the dimension by which the contents of other dimensions change.
This this is also true if you were to travel along any dimension -
the contents of other dimensions, from your perspective, would be changing as you move along this dimension.

We experience time thought through slices of it.
Where other dimensions we can experience a wider collection of slices at once -
you can see along the landscape simultaneously, but there a limits to how far we can see - primarily biological ones.

It is this discrepancy that sets our experience of time apart.
But from the eternal perspective, time is akin to all other dimensions.

To get back to my point...

Hypothetically, every unique state of existence could be catalogued.
If this we done, then this catalogue - this set -
by the prior definition of rational limits,
would represent the size of existence's time:
the number of unique states it can be in.

A potentially limited set, that eternally repeats.

But if we step back, and look at this 'existence loop' -
it is an eternal object - and the only thing that exists.
Existence is.

-

I feel like there's a lot more I could say.
Like my beliefs on it's implications for reincarnation.
Or the ethics that arise in recognition of this.

But this feels like a good place to stop rambling.

..

If knowledge is power,
then to share what one believes to be knowledge,
is to empower others.
Ideally, to make wiser, more well informed decisions.

Ben JS
Posts: 223
Joined: Fri Dec 16, 2022 10:38 am
Location: Australia

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:49 pm

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:32 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 3:46 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 06, 2025 3:33 am
> > > As expressed existence itself has no reason or why. Those are complexities concerning conscious beings and particular things.
> > >
> > > Reason is an aspect of existence, not a cause of existence or something beyond existence.
> > >
> > > Reason could not cause or initiate existence when reason itself is existence.
> > >
> > > To reiterate there is no reason or why for existence. Existence simply is. Reason and why concern conscious beings and particular or specific things.
> > >
> > > You seem to claim existence itself has or had some reason for being. I'm asking that you provide an example of such reason not involving conscious beings or particular things to illustrate such reason for existence itself. Illustrate your point.
> >
> > OBVIOUSLY it is an ABSOLUTE IMPOSSIBILITY to provide examples of 'reason' or 'why' for absolutely ANY thing, which does not involve conscious human beings.
> >
> > ONLY conscious human beings can 'make up' reasons or whys, and only conscious human beings can express and receive reasons and whys. So, again, it is IMPOSSIBLE to provide examples of 'reason' and 'why', which do not involve conscious human beings. So, it does NOT MAKE ACTUAL SENSE to ASK FOR examples that could NEVER be provided.
> >
> > LOL ONCE MORE NO one can PROVIDE you of what you are ASKING FOR, here, BECAUSE it is, OBVIOUSLY, an IMPOSSIBILITY.
> >
> > you are CONFLATED TWO DIFFERENT things, and then 'TRYING TO' CLAIM that because one can NOT BE DONE, therefore, the other does EXIST.
>
> **Precisely the point**.
>
> Reason for existence cannot be provided not because things are conflated, rather because existence itself lacks reason.

But 'eason for Existence HAS ALREADY BEEN PROVIDED. So, your CLAIM that reason for Existence cannot be provided is OBVIOUSLY False.

Now, ONCE.MORE, you are absolutely FREE to BELIEVE whatever you like, but just because you might BELIEVE some thing is true that in and itself does NOT make it true. For example you may well ALSO BELIEVE that Life, itself, lacks meaning, AS WELL. But what makes your BELIEF, here, true?

Just SAYING and CLAIMING that reason for Existence can NOT be provided, because, "daniel j lavender" BELIEVES, Existence, Itself, lacks reason, is NEVER EVER going to suffice.

EXPLAIN TO the readers, here, what 'it' IS, EXACTLY, which MAKES your BELIEF, here, true

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:49 pm
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:32 pm
> > Reason for existence cannot be provided not because things are conflated, rather because existence itself lacks reason.
>
> But 'eason for Existence HAS ALREADY BEEN PROVIDED. So, your CLAIM that reason for Existence cannot be provided is OBVIOUSLY False.

The reason you provide:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 3:46 am
> 'I' WILL, AGAIN, say what is the REASON WHY Existence, Itself, TO me.
>
> The REASON Existence, Itself, exists is so that 'I' can BEAR WITNESS TO the beauty that 'I' AM Creating, HERE-NOW.

…concerns you particularly, it concerns a conscious individual.

It is *your* contrivance; a reason for and of you as a conscious being, not existence itself.

Existence itself cannot have causal reason. Any claimed reason for existence would itself be part of existence.

Existence *is* reason, not merely *from* or *for* reason.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:49 pm
> Now, ONCE.MORE, you are absolutely FREE to BELIEVE whatever you like, but just because you might BELIEVE some thing is true that in and itself does NOT make it true. For example you may well ALSO BELIEVE that Life, itself, lacks meaning, AS WELL. But what makes your BELIEF, here, true?
>
> Just SAYING and CLAIMING that reason for Existence can NOT be provided, because, "daniel j lavender" BELIEVES, Existence, Itself, lacks reason, is NEVER EVER going to suffice.
>
> EXPLAIN TO the readers, here, what 'it' IS, EXACTLY, which MAKES your BELIEF, here, true

Existence is not devoid of reason nor is life devoid of meaning. The point is conscious, living beings construct those things.

Reason is part of existence, not something beyond existence. Nor is reason a cause of existence. Reason could not cause existence as reason itself is existence.

Existence cannot have a cause as any cause would be existence. Existence is eternal.

As existence is eternal any causal reason would be applied after the fact of existence already being. Any reason would be contrivance.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Wed Apr 09, 2025 6:56 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:49 pm
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:32 pm
> > > Reason for existence cannot be provided not because things are conflated, rather because existence itself lacks reason.
> >
> > But 'eason for Existence HAS ALREADY BEEN PROVIDED. So, your CLAIM that reason for Existence cannot be provided is OBVIOUSLY False.
>
> The reason you provide:
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 3:46 am
> > 'I' WILL, AGAIN, say what is the REASON WHY Existence, Itself, TO me.
> >
> > The REASON Existence, Itself, exists is so that 'I' can BEAR WITNESS TO the beauty that 'I' AM Creating, HERE-NOW.
>
> …concerns you particularly, it concerns a conscious individual.

OBVIOUSLY, 'you' do NOT YET KNOW 'Who 'I' AM', correct?

For, if you DID, then you would NOT have SAID and WROTE what you just did, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> It is *your* contrivance; a reason for and of you as a conscious being, not existence itself.

you ARE MISSING THE MARK, and WHOLE POINT, here. But, this is just because 'you' are NOT YET ABLE TO ANSWER the QUESTION, 'Who am 'I'? Correct?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> Existence itself cannot have causal reason. Any claimed reason for existence would itself be part of existence.

But, 'you' being a PARTLY 'conscious being', here, is NOT 'the one' who HAS and HOLDS 'the ANSWER', here. Or, do you, a human being, BELIEVE that 'you' DO?

Also, and OBVIOUSLY, 'your' OWN individual human being 'claimed reason' that there is NO 'reason' for Existence, Itself, would itself be a part of Existence, Itself, correct?

And, if yes, then you ALSO WANTING TO CLAIM that ANY 'claimed reason', being PART OF 'Existence', Itself, would then AUTOMATICALLY FORFEIT 'the reason', FORFEIT your OWN 'reasons' and CLAIMS, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> Existence *is* reason, not merely *from* or *for* reason.

But, this is ONLY one individual human beings OWN view and perspective, based upon 'a reason', which is just part of Existence, Itself.

Now, the ACTUAL REASON Existence, Itself, EXISTS is so that 'I' can BEAR WITNESS TO the BEAUTY that 'I' AM CREATING HERE, NOW. AND, WHEN, and IF, you EVER COME TO, ALSO, UNDERSTAND and KNOW WHO 'I' AM, EXACTLY, then 'you' WILL ALSO SEE HOW and WHY 'this' IS ABSOLUTELY True, Right, Accurate, AND Correct.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:49 pm
> > Now, ONCE.MORE, you are absolutely FREE to BELIEVE whatever you like, but just because you might BELIEVE some thing is true that in and itself does NOT make it true. For example you may well ALSO BELIEVE that Life, itself, lacks meaning, AS WELL. But what makes your BELIEF, here, true?
> >
> > Just SAYING and CLAIMING that reason for Existence can NOT be provided, because, "daniel j lavender" BELIEVES, Existence, Itself, lacks reason, is NEVER EVER going to suffice.
> >
> > EXPLAIN TO the readers, here, what 'it' IS, EXACTLY, which MAKES your BELIEF, here, true
>
> Existence is not devoid of reason nor is life devoid of meaning. The point is conscious, living beings construct those things.

NO one, here, has even thought, let alone said, otherwise.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> Reason is part of existence, not something beyond existence.

There is NO 'thing' BEYOND Existence. And AGAIN, NO one, here, has even thought, let alone said, otherwise.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> Nor is reason a cause of existence. Reason could not cause existence as reason itself is existence.

ONCE AGAIN, NO one, here, has even thought, let alone said, otherwise.

It REALLY would be GREAT if you JUST FOLLOW 'the words', here, ONLY, and NOT FOLLOW your OWN assuming and believing.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> Existence cannot have a cause as any cause would be existence. Existence is eternal.

ONCE AGAIN, just because "daniel j lavender" BELIEVES some thing to be true WILL NEVER EVER MEAN NOR MAKE 'that thing' true.

Can you, at least, COMPREHEND and UNDERSTAND this Fact?

If yes, then what ACTUAL PROVE, IS THERE, that there IS, supposedly, NO 'reason' AT ALL FOR the EXISTENCE OF 'Existence', Itself?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> As existence is eternal any causal reason would be applied after the fact of existence already being. Any reason would be contrivance.

Have you EVER CONSIDERED that THE REASON that 'Existence', Itself, EXISTS has been 'around' for AS LONG AS 'Existence', Itself, HAS BEEN?

If no, then WHY NOT?

WHY are you ONLY 'considering' SOME things, here, ONLY?

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 6:56 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> > Existence itself cannot have causal reason. Any claimed reason for existence would itself be part of existence.
>
> Also, and OBVIOUSLY, 'your' OWN individual human being 'claimed reason' that there is NO 'reason' for Existence, Itself, would itself be a part of Existence, Itself, correct?
>
> And, if yes, then you ALSO WANTING TO CLAIM that ANY 'claimed reason', being PART OF 'Existence', Itself, would then AUTOMATICALLY FORFEIT 'the reason', FORFEIT your OWN 'reasons' and CLAIMS, here.

Existence involves reason in part. Reason is a construct concerning particular things often conflated with existence in its general sense. For example, the universe may have been created for or by reason of a creator yet that reason would apply specifically to that particular arrangement. The causal reason would concern a particular configuration, not existence.

Existence itself cannot have causal reason. Any claimed reason would have qualities substantiating it as a thing or as part of existence. For example, its initiation of [another part of] existence or its interaction with [another part of] existence would substantiate it as a thing.

Any thing would be [part of] existence. Existence would not cause existence. Existence would already be.

The point is existence itself has no *initiating cause or reason* as articulated in the original statement and essay note.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 6:56 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> > As existence is eternal any causal reason would be applied after the fact of existence already being. Any reason would be contrivance.
>
> Have you EVER CONSIDERED that THE REASON that 'Existence', Itself, EXISTS has been 'around' for AS LONG AS 'Existence', Itself, HAS BEEN?
>
> If no, then WHY NOT?
>
> WHY are you ONLY 'considering' SOME things, here, ONLY?

As expressed in the original essay:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> As existence never began, as existence had no starting point things wouldn't need to advance or develop from a beginning. There wouldn't be a beginning to need to develop from. Things would always be existent and could exist at any level of development at any given time. This essentially means life, or consciousness, could be eternal.

Reason is an aspect of existence involving conscious beings. Consciousness is presumably eternal and so is reason.

Existence just is. Sequence and time, like reason, are constructs concerning particulars often conflated with existence in its general sense. Attempting to apply chronological order to reason and existence struggles because reason *is* existence.

Existence *is* reason. Existence does not merely come from reason or begin because of reason. Reason *is* existence. That is precisely why there is no reason causing existence.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 6:56 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> > > Existence itself cannot have causal reason. Any claimed reason for existence would itself be part of existence.
> >
> > Also, and OBVIOUSLY, 'your' OWN individual human being 'claimed reason' that there is NO 'reason' for Existence, Itself, would itself be a part of Existence, Itself, correct?
> >
> > And, if yes, then you ALSO WANTING TO CLAIM that ANY 'claimed reason', being PART OF 'Existence', Itself, would then AUTOMATICALLY FORFEIT 'the reason', FORFEIT your OWN 'reasons' and CLAIMS, here.
>
> Existence involves reason in part. Reason is a construct concerning particular things often conflated with existence in its general sense. For example, the universe may have been created for or by reason of a creator yet that reason would apply specifically to that particular arrangement. The causal reason would concern a particular configuration, not existence.

1. you are, again, just saying and writing things that are already known.

2. The Universe could never have begun nor created all at once. So, saying that the Universe 'may have been created' is just False, and Wrong.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Existence itself cannot have causal reason.

Once again, no one has said It could, so 'this', here, is moot, again.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Any claimed reason would have qualities substantiating it as a thing or as part of existence.

'This', again, is coming from a very, very closed view and perspective.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> For example, its initiation of [another part of] existence or its interaction with [another part of] existence would substantiate it as a thing.

But there are no 'another part of Existence', Itself, so 'the rest' is moot, too.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Any thing would be [part of] existence. Existence would not cause existence. Existence would already be.

Why are you presenting 'things', which could not be, as though they 'could be', and then 'trying to' argue against 'them'?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> The point is existence itself has no *initiating cause or reason* as articulated in the original statement and essay note.

No one, here, has ever thought, let alone said and claimed, that 'Existence', Itself, has some so-called 'initiating cause nor reason. So, why are you, again, introducing things, which no one, here, has ever thought nor said, and then are 'trying to' argue against 'them'?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 6:56 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Apr 09, 2025 5:58 am
> > > As existence is eternal any causal reason would be applied after the fact of existence already being. Any reason would be contrivance.
> >
> > Have you EVER CONSIDERED that THE REASON that 'Existence', Itself, EXISTS has been 'around' for AS LONG AS 'Existence', Itself, HAS BEEN?
> >
> > If no, then WHY NOT?
> >
> > WHY are you ONLY 'considering' SOME things, here, ONLY?
>
> As expressed in the original essay:
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> > As existence never began, as existence had no starting point things wouldn't need to advance or develop from a beginning. There wouldn't be a beginning to need to develop from. Things would always be existent and could exist at any level of development at any given time. This essentially means life, or consciousness, could be eternal.

Are you aware of the contradictions and inconsistencies in this what you call 'original essay'?

If yes, then great.

But, if no, then would like to be informed of what they are, where they are, and more importantly why they are?

If yes, then great.

But if no, then why not?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Reason is an aspect of existence involving conscious beings. Consciousness is presumably eternal and so is reason.

Which all means 'what', exactly?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Existence just is.

It can also be said, and 'argued', 'human snot' just is, as well.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Sequence and time, like reason, are constructs concerning particulars often conflated with existence in its general sense. Attempting to apply chronological order to reason and existence struggles because reason *is* existence.

But, there is no so-called 'struggle' at all, here, when and if one already knows what 'the reason' is for 'Existence', Itself.

But, obviously there are few other things one must learn, and/or discover and know, beforehand, before the reason of 'why' things are, exactly, also comes to be learned, and known.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Existence *is* reason.

Really?

I thought that 'Existence' is Existence, and, 'reason' is reason. But, if you really want to believe and claim that 'Existence' is reason, then that is okay and fine, with me.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> Existence does not merely come from reason or begin because of reason. Reason *is* existence. That is precisely why there is no reason causing existence.

Who has ever, ever thought, said, or claimed that there was 'a reason' causing Existence, Itself?

Why do you keep 'drifting off', and 'drifting off so far', from what I have actually been saying and claiming, here?

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > Existence involves reason in part. Reason is a construct concerning particular things often conflated with existence in its general sense. For example, the universe may have been created for or by reason of a creator yet that reason would apply specifically to that particular arrangement. The causal reason would concern a particular configuration, not existence.
>
> 1. you are, again, just saying and writing things that are already known.
>
> 2. The Universe could never have begun nor created all at once. So, saying that the Universe 'may have been created' is just False, and Wrong.

The universe certainly could have been created. In your own words:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Mar 25, 2025 5:05 am
> Why are you CLOSED, here?
>
> AGAIN, WHY are you CLOSED?
>
> WHAT made or CAUSED you to BECOME CLOSED?

Universe is a restrictive, limited term and as illustrated serves largely to deny a higher power. Existence is the more comprehensive term. Existence is the more practical term as well.

With the terms and definitions provided one could point to a leaf, or any other item, and easily claim existence. However one could not point to a leaf and easily claim universe. Universe is a restrictive term.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > As expressed in the original essay:
>
> Are you aware of the contradictions and inconsistencies in this what you call 'original essay'?
>
> If yes, then great.
>
> But, if no, then would like to be informed of what they are, where they are, and more importantly why they are?
>
> If yes, then great.
>
> But if no, then why not?

Identify them.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > Existence *is* reason.
>
> Really?
>
> I thought that 'Existence' is Existence, and, 'reason' is reason. But, if you really want to believe and claim that 'Existence' is reason, then that is okay and fine, with me.

Reason is a thing, a part of existence as defined in the original text. Reason is perceived substantiating it as a thing.

Reason is [part of] existence.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > The point is existence itself has no *initiating cause or reason* as articulated in the original statement and essay note.
>
> No one, here, has ever thought, let alone said and claimed, that 'Existence', Itself, has some so-called 'initiating cause nor reason. So, why are you, again, introducing things, which no one, here, has ever thought nor said, and then are 'trying to' argue against 'them'?

Then with the original statement you agree.

When considered completely and in context that is what the original statement conveys, no causal reason for existence itself. You, however, isolate single sentences and statements then scrutinize the resulting disconnection.

Your method in debate consists of isolating statements, removing context and then questioning the basis of the disconnected fragments. You then lock interlocutors in repetitive loops of argumentation amongst the fragments.

For example you criticize the exclusion of why or reason when why or reason are not excluded but implicitly attributed to particular things.
What is articulated is eternal existence itself having no causal reason:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Mar 24, 2025 10:08 am
> - It may be questioned why existence is. There is no why or reason. Why would imply a cause or a beginning. Existence is eternal and did not begin. There was no reason initiating existence as existence is eternal. There is no reason for existence. Existence simply is.

Feel free to introduce a new topic for discussion.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Pistolero** » Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:47 pm

Existence is continuous.
It has to beginning and no end, only cycles.
It requires no creator.
It is not enclosed.
Existence is dynamic and interactive - energy: a state of agitation.
Existence is not absolute - indivisible, immutable; not a thing, but a static but a dynamic process.
Existence is multiplicity . not a singularity. It is conceptualized as a singularity (universe, cosmos) by human minds projecting consciousness in a position "outside existence" to then conceptualize it as a singular whole.
Existence is presence - past made present, perceived as the apparent.
Existence is not entirely ordered. Chaos is in existence - energies with no pattern = chaos.
Past = determined immutable. **Present = mutable, dynamic, existent**. Future = what is being determined in the present.

Pistolero
Posts: 703
Joined: Sat Apr 05, 2025 1:20 pm

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Thu Apr 10, 2025 9:43 pm

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > > Existence involves reason in part. Reason is a construct concerning particular things often conflated with existence in its general sense. For example, the universe may have been created for or by reason of a creator yet that reason would apply specifically to that particular arrangement. The causal reason would concern a particular configuration, not existence.
> >
> > 1. you are, again, just saying and writing things that are already known.
> >
> > 2. The Universe could never have begun nor created all at once. So, saying that the Universe 'may have been created' is just False, and Wrong.
>
> The universe certainly could have been created.

The 'Universe', by definition, has to be and is infinite and eternal, and therefore was not 'created', in the sense if all at once by something else.

The infinite Universe is in an eternal Creation.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
> In your own words:
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Mar 25, 2025 5:05 am
> > Why are you CLOSED, here?
> >
> > AGAIN, WHY are you CLOSED?
> >
> > WHAT made or CAUSED you to BECOME CLOSED?

Yes, 'they' are my own words.

But, obviously when one already knows, for sure, what actual took place, or takes place, then that one also already knows that any thing conflicting or contradicting with what took place, or takes place, did not and count not have happened.

The Universe did not and certainly could not have been 'created', in 'the way' you are talking about and imagining, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
> Universe is a restrictive, limited term and as illustrated serves largely to deny a higher power.

If this is what you want to believe is true, then okay, but please inform 'the readers', here, how you are defining the 'Universe' word, and, what could possibly have a higher power than 'That'.

Also, I never saw nor recognized any so-called 'illustration' above, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
> Existence is the more comprehensive term. Existence is the more practical term as well.
>
> With the terms and definitions provided one could point to a leaf, or any other item, and easily claim existence. However one could not point to a leaf and easily claim universe. Universe is a restrictive term.

'leaf' therefore is also a so-called restrictive term, and so to is 'existence' a so-called restrictive term, but so what?

By definition 'definitions' are 'restrictive terms'. For if they were not, then nothing at all would make sense to you human beings, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > > As expressed in the original essay:
> >
> > Are you aware of the contradictions and inconsistencies in this what you call 'original essay'?
> >
> > If yes, then great.
> >
> > But, if no, then would like to be informed of what they are, where they are, and more importantly why they are?
> >
> > If yes, then great.
> >
> > But if no, then why not?
>
> Identify them.

Okay, but so 'we' are in agreement, and, literally, on the same page, where, exactly, is the so-called 'original essay', here?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 3:33 am
> > > Existence *is* reason.
> >
> > Really?
> >
> > I thought that 'Existence' is Existence, and, 'reason' is reason. But, if you really want to believe and claim that 'Existence' is reason, then that is okay and fine, with me.
>
> Reason is a thing, a part of existence as defined in the original text. Reason is perceived substantiating it as a thing.
>
> Reason is [part of] existence.

Just like 'reason' is a part of the Universe and of Life, Itself. Which just like 'Existence', Itself, are all infinite and eternal.

But, your own 'restrictive terms' tell you otherwise, correct?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm

Age
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am